DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 683 FL 013 982

TITLE	Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act. Hearing on H. R. 2708 to Further the National Security and Improve the Economy of the United States by Providing Grants for the Improvement of Proficiency in Critical Languages, for the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Foreign Language Instruction... before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary,and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, First Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	9 May 83
NOTE	44p.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Higher Education; *Second Language Instruction; Study Abroad; *Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 98th

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of the hearing on proposed legislation to fund foreign language instruction in critical languages are presented. Included are the text of H.R. 2708, statements by two educators, and an assortment of prepared statements and letters. The bill provides grants for improving language instruction at all educational levels. Among the instructional programs to be funded are study abroad programs for the study of Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Russian, Hindi, and African languages. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FOREIGN LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE FOR NATIONAL SECURITY ACT

ED235683

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 2708

TO FURTHER THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND IMPROVE THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES BY PROVIDING GRANTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF PROFICIENCY IN CRITICAL LANGUAGES, FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, AND FOR PER CAPITA GRANTS TO REIMBURSE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TO PROMOTE THE GROWTH AND IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF POSTSECONDARY FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON MAY 9, 1983

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

FL013982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

22-021 O WASHINGTON : 1983

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (Bill) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
FRANK HARRISON, Pennsylvania
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
(Vacancy)
(Vacancy)

JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
RON PACKARD, California
HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
(Vacancy)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
RON PACKARD, California
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois,
(Ex Officio)
(Vacancy)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C., on May 9, 1983	1
Text of H.R. 2708	2
Statement of:	
Freitag, Bernie, vice president, National Education Association, accompanied by Linda Tarr-Whelan, director of Government relations, NEA	18
Fernandez, Marcello, Director, bilingual education, Dist. Public Schools, accompanied by Frank, Miele, principal Oyster School	23
Prepared statement, letters, supplemental materials, and so forth:	
Freitag, Bernie, vice president, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., prepared statement of	21

FOREIGN LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE FOR NATIONAL SECURITY ACT

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1983

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY,
SECONDARY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m. in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Ackerman, Kildee, Packard, Gunderson, and Nielson.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, counsel; Nancy Kober, legislative specialist.

[The text of H.R. 2708 follows:]

I

98TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2708

To further the national security and improve the economy of the United States by providing grants for the improvement of proficiency in critical languages, for the improvement of elementary and secondary foreign language instruction, and for per capita grants to reimburse institutions of higher education to promote the growth and improve the quality of postsecondary foreign language instruction.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 21, 1983

Mr. SIMON (for himself, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BARNES, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. SEIBERLING) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

A BILL

To further the national security and improve the economy of the United States by providing grants for the improvement of proficiency in critical languages, for the improvement of elementary and secondary foreign language instruction, and for per capita grants to reimburse institutions of higher education to promote the growth and improve the quality of postsecondary foreign language instruction.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That this Act may be cited as "Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act of 1983".

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) the economic and security interests of this Nation require significant improvement in the quantity and quality of foreign language instruction offered in the Nation's educational institutions, and Federal funds should be made available to assist this purpose;

(2) many endeavors in both the public and private sectors involving such matters as international relations or multinational business transactions require the skills of individuals with knowledge of foreign languages; and

(3) the educational institutions of the Nation should provide students with an understanding of the history and culture which influence the perspectives, values, and attitudes of the people of other countries, and foreign language instruction is one means of achieving this goal.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall make grants to State educational agencies whose applications are approved under subsection (b) in order that such agencies may fund model programs, designed and operated by local educational agencies, providing for commencement or improvement and expansion of foreign language study for students residing within their school districts. Any State whose application is ap-

proved shall receive an amount equal to the sum of (1) $50,000, plus (2) the product of $0.04 multiplied by the population of the State (as determined in accordance with the most recent decennial census). The amount described in the preceding sentence shall be made available to the State for two additional years after the first fiscal year during which the State received a grant under this section if the Secretary determines that the funds made available to the State during the first year of funding were used in the manner required under the State's approved application.

(b) Any State educational agency desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application—

(1) contains a description of model programs designed by local educational agencies, and representing a variety of alternative and innovative approaches to foreign language instruction, which were selected by the State educational agency for funding under this section;

(2) provides assurances that all children aged five through seventeen who reside within the school district of the local educational agency shall be eligible to par-

ticipate in any model program funded under this section (without regard to whether such children attend schools operated by such agency);

(3) provides assurances that, if the application of the State educational agency is approved, each model program described in the application shall have available to it sufficient funds from State and local sources, in addition to any funds under this section, to ensure that the program is carried out as described in the application; and

(4) provides that the local educational agency will provide standard evaluations of pupils' proficiency at appropriate intervals in the program, and provide such evaluations to the State educational agency.

(c) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which State educational agencies may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall make grants to State agencies whose applications are approved under subsection (b) for the purpose of providing assistance to model programs designed and operated by community and junior colleges providing for the commencement or improvement and expansion of foreign language studies at those institutions. Any State whose application is so approved shall receive an amount

equal to the sum of (1) $30,000, plus (2) the product of $0.01 multiplied by the population of the State (as determined in accordance with the most recent decennial census).

(b) Any State desiring to receive a grant under this section shall, through a State agency designated (in accordance with State law) for this purpose, submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application—

(1) contains a description of model programs designed by community and junior colleges, and representing a variety of alternative and innovative approaches to foreign language instruction, which were selected by the State agency for funding under this section;

(2) provides assurances that, if the application of the State agency is approved, each model program described in the application shall have available to it sufficient funds from State and local sources, in addition to any funds under this section, to ensure that the program is carried out as described in the application; and

(3) provides that the community and junior colleges will provide standard evaluations of pupils' profi-

ciency at appropriate intervals in the program, and provide such evaluations to the State agency.

(c) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which State agencies may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

SEC. 5. (a)(1) The Secretary shall make grants to institutions of higher education to reimburse such institutions for part of the costs of providing undergraduate foreign language instruction to students at such institutions. Any institution of higher education desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

(2)(A) An institution of higher education shall not be eligible for a grant under this section for a fiscal year unless—

(i) the sum of the number of students enrolled at such institution in qualified postsecondary language courses on October 1 of that fiscal year exceeds 5 per centum of the total number of students enrolled at such institution; and

(ii) such institution requires that each entering student have successfully completed at least two years of secondary school foreign language instruction or re-

quires that each graduating student have earned two years of postsecondary credit in a foreign language (or have demonstrated equivalent competence in a foreign language).

(B) For purposes of subparagraph(A)(i), the total number of students enrolled in an institution shall be considered to be equal to the sum of (i) the number of full-time degree candidate students enrolled at the institution, and (ii) the number of part-time degree candidate students who are enrolled at the institution for an academic workload which is at least half the full-time academic workload, as determined by the institution in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary.

(3) As a condition for the award of any grant under this section, the Secretary may establish criteria for evaluating programs assisted with funds under this section and require an annual report which evaluates the progress and proficiency of students in such programs.

(b)(1) Any institution of higher education which submits an application under this section for a grant for any fiscal year, and which has sufficient undergraduate enrollment in postsecondary language courses and foreign language requirements as required under subsection (a)(2), shall be eligible to receive an amount equal to the sum of the following:

(A) To provide assistance for the costs of postsecondary foreign language instruction at the level of the first or second year of postsecondary study of a language, an amount equal to—

(i) $30, multiplied by

(ii) the remainder, if any, of—

(I) the number of students enrolled in a qualified postsecondary foreign language course at such level on October 1 of such fiscal year, minus

(II) the number of students equal to 5 per centum of the total number of students enrolled at such institution.

(B) To provide assistance for the costs of foreign language instruction above the level of the second year of postsecondary study of a language, an amount equal to—

(i) $40, multiplied by

(ii) the number of students enrolled in a qualified postsecondary foreign language course at such level on October 1 of such fiscal year.

(2) Any institution which is eligible to receive an amount under paragraph (1) shall be eligible to receive an additional amount equal to $40 multiplied by the number of students enrolled (at any level of instruction) in any foreign

language instruction in languages determined by the Secretary to be less commonly taught.

(c) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which an institution of higher education may receive under subsection (b), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall make grants to an institution of higher education (or a consortium of such institutions) in each Federal region whose application is approved under subsection (b) for the purposes of providing assistance to summer intensive language training institutes for exceptional secondary school students. Any institution or consortium whose application is so approved shall receive an amount equal to not more than $3,000 multiplied by the number of students, not to exceed one hundred and fifty, enrolled in such institute.

(b) Any institution of higher education or consortium of such institutions desiring to receive the grant for its region shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No such application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application—

(1) contains a description of the proposed program of intensive instruction, which may include but is not limited to the languages described in section 8(b)(1);

(2) provides adequate assurance that students from any Federal region who wish to participate will be selected on the basis of aptitude in that language, as determined by appropriate testing and verified by their teachers, and of motivation;

(3) provides assurances that the institution of higher education will seek to enroll at least eighty qualified students in the institute; and

(4) provides assurances that the program of intensive instruction will be developed and operated in close cooperation with secondary school teachers and administrators.

(c) The Secretary shall encourage, to the extent possible, diversity in the languages taught in institutes during any summer within the United States.

(d) Awards under this section shall be made to institutes (or consortia) on the basis of excellence of the program proposed in the application, taking into consideration such elements as library resources, faculty achievement, and language learning facilities

(e) Funds available to institutes under this section may be used to cover costs associated with enrollment in an insti-

tute, including tuition, fees, administration, and living expenses.

(f) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which institutions of higher education may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary shall make grants to an institution of higher education (or a consortium of such institutions) in each Federal region whose application is approved under subsection (b) for the purposes of providing assistance to summer language training institutes for the professional development of the proficiency of elementary and secondary school language teachers. Any institution or consortium whose application is so approved shall receive an amount equal to not more than $3,000 multiplied by the number of teachers, not to exceed three hundred, enrolled in such institute.

(b) Any institution of higher education or consortium of such institutions desiring to receive the grant for its region shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No such application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application—

(1) contains a description of the proposed program of instruction;

(2) provides adequate assurance that teachers from any Federal region who wish to participate will be selected on the basis of recommendations from a principal or other supervisory official and a demonstrated commitment to the teaching of the language studied in the institute; and

(3) provides assurances that the institution of higher education will seek to enroll at least eighty qualified students in the institute.

(c) Awards under this section shall be made to institutes (or consortia) on the basis of excellence of the program proposed in the application, taking into consideration such elements as library resources, faculty achievement, and language learning facilities.

(d) Funds available to institutes under this section may be used to cover costs associated with enrollment in an institute, including tuition, fees, administration, and living expenses.

(e) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which institutions of higher education may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

22-021 O - 83 -- 2

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary shall make grants to institutions of higher education, or to consortia of such institutions, whose application is approved under subsection (b) for the purposes of providing assistance to enable advanced foreign language students to develop their language skills and their knowledge of foreign cultures and societies through study abroad. Such study abroad may be combined with an internship in an international business enterprise. Any institution or consortium whose application is so approved shall be eligible to receive a grant in an amount not to exceed one-half the cost of providing such assistance.

(b) Any institution of higher education or consortium of such institutions desiring to receive a grant under this section shall submit an application therefor to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require. No such application may be approved by the Secretary unless the application—

(1) contains a description of the proposed program of study abroad in any of the following areas:

(A) Latin America for the study of Spanish or Portuguese;

(B) the Middle East for the study of Arabic and other major languages of that region;

(C) Japan for the study of Japanese;

(D) the People's Republic of China or the Republic of China for the study of Chinese;

(E) the Democratic Republic of Korea for the study of Korean;

(F) the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the study of Russian and other major languages of that region;

(G) Africa for the study of major languages of that region; and

(H) South Asia for the study of Hindi and other major languages of that region;

(2) provides adequate assurance that those who wish to participate will be selected on the basis of demonstrated proficiency in the language, as shown by testing comparable to that conducted by the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State; and

(3) demonstrates that the program will provide the opportunity to combine language study with the study of journalism, international business, finance, economic development, science, engineering, political science, international studies, or other related areas and is open to students majoring in those areas if they can qualify under paragraph (2).

(c) Funds available to institutes under this section may be used to cover costs associated with enrollment in an insti-

tute, including tuition, fees, administration, and living expenses.

(d) If sums appropriated to carry out this section are not sufficient to permit the Secretary to pay in full the grants which institutions of higher education may receive under subsection (a), the amount of such grants shall be ratably reduced.

SEC. 9. No grants shall be made or contracts entered into under this Act except to such extent, or in such amounts, as may be provided in appropriation Acts.

SEC. 10. For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "institution of higher education" means any institution of higher education, as defined under section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which is located within a State, but does not include a community or junior college.

(2) The terms "community college" and "junior college" mean any institution of higher education, as defined under section 1201(a) of such Act, which is located within a State and which provides a two-year program for which awards an associate degree or which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree.

(3) The terms "local educational agency" and "State educational agency" have the same meaning

given such terms under section 198 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(4) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

(5) The term "State" means any of the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(6) The term "qualified postsecondary foreign language course" means a course of foreign language instruction which (A) is scheduled to meet at least five days each week for at least fifty minutes each day, or (B) provides instruction each week for a period of time equivalent to the period described under clause (A).

SEC. 11. There are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1984, 1985, and 1986—

(1) $10,000,000 to carry out section 3 of this Act;

(2) $4,000,000 to carry out section 4 of this Act;

(3) $11,000,000 to carry out section 5 of this Act;

(4) $5,000,000 to carry out section 6 of this Act;

(5) $10,000,000 to carry out section 7 of this Act; and

(6) $10,000,000 to carry out section 8 of this Act.

Chairman PERKINS. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education is conducting a hearing today on H.R. 2708, the Foreign Language Assistance for National Security Act of 1983.

This bill creates a new Federal program of aid to elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education, for the purposes of expanding and improving courses in foreign language.

This bill had been jointly referred to both the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education and the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.

Last week, the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education reported the bill to the full committee.

I am pleased to have two distinguished witnesses before the subcommittee this morning to discuss the bill.

STATEMENTS OF BERNIE FREITAG, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, ACCOMPANIED BY LINDA TARR-WHELAN, DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, NEA

Chairman PERKINS. This morning we have Bernie Freitag, vice president of the National Education Association, and Marcello Fernandez, director of bilingual education, District of Columbia Public Schools.

Come around, Mr. Freitag, and Mr. Fernandez, we will hear both of you. Go right ahead, Mr. Freitag. We appreciate your being here today.

Mr. FREITAG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Bernie Freitag, the vice president of the National Education Association, and I am accompanied this morning by Ms. Linda Tarr-Whelan, who is director of government relations for the National Education Association.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the National Education Association is the largest professional organization of employees in the United States.

As a teacher of foreign language, I am heartened at the attention being devoted to improving foreign language instruction as evidenced by this hearing. I have taught German in the high schools of Bucks County in Pennsylvania since 1981, and I think I owe my career in education very much to the opportunities made available by the Federal Government through the National Defense Education Act.

In the summer of 1961, I attended an NDEA institute in Bucks County for teachers of all foreign languages. The summer of 1982, I attended an NDEA level-I institution at Hofra University for teachers of German, a level-II grant, through Stanford University in Germany in the summer of 1963.

I was a Fulbright exchange teacher in Bavaria, Germany, in 1964–65, and was a guest of the West German Parliament for a travel study grant which was administered by Stanford University in the summer of 1966. I think I can say without question that if it were not for the opportunities made possible by the Federal Government through the National Defense Education Act, I would not be a teacher today.

I wish to stress the appreciation of the teachers of the United States for the consistent efforts of this committee and, in particular, for your efforts, Mr. Chairman, to see to it that the very important role as a partner with State and local governments in the support of public education be fulfilled.

We have already received the first few of a flood of reports from prestigious groups which are diagnosing the status of the American education system, principally the American public school system, and will be making prescriptions for the future.

Many teachers might reflect their preferences for more emphasis on action plans for improvement rather than prolonged study of the problem when they respond that the reports confirm what the committee on incompetent teachers already know.

Nevertheless, if our Nation needs the catalyst supplied these reports to cause us to focus on our public education system as a national priority, we can only welcome the reports and hope that the determination they generate to achieve a sustained and alert partnership, local, State and National, in the support of excellence in our American system of public education, will result in solutions based on sound research, good commonsense, and sensitivity to the diversity of needs for education and in education by all students, whether in early childhood education or through adult education.

The goal is quality free public education for all.

In its report, "A Nation at Risk," the National Commission on Excellence in Education lists among the tools at hand the traditional belief that paying for education is an investment in every renewal and human resources that are more durable and flexible than capital plan and equipment, and the availability in this country of sufficient financial means to invest in education.

It lists also the equally sound tradition from the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 until today, that the Federal Government should supplement State, local, and other resources to foster key national education goals.

Indeed, in its recommendations concerning content, the Commission calls for the college bound to have 2 years of foreign language in high school, in addition to the basic courses and other courses in foreign language taken earlier. They call for a high level of shared education in the basics, as they describe them, together with work in the fine and performing arts and foreign language which constitute the mind and spirit of our culture.

In their recommendations, implementing recommendations, they speak to the fact that in addition to the new basics, as they define them, other important curriculum matters must be addressed. Achieving proficiency in a foreign language ordinarily requires from 4 to 6 years of study and should, therefore, be started in the elementary grades. We believe the Commission says it is desirable that students achieve such proficiency because study of a foreign language introduces students to non-English speaking cultures, heightens awareness and comprehension of one's native tongue, and serves the Nation's needs in commerce, diplomacy, and education.

The Commission goes on to say that the curriculum in the crucial eight grades leading to the high school years should be specifically designed to provide a sound base for study in those and later

years in such areas as English language development and writing, computational and problem-solving skills, science, social studies, foreign language, and the arts.

These years should foster and enthusiasm for learning the development of the individual's gifts and talent. In their recommendations concerning standards and expectations, the Commission calls for 4-year colleges and universities that should raise this administration's requirements and advise all potential applicants of the standards for admission in terms of specific courses required.

Performance in these areas and levels of achievement on standardized achievement tests in each of the five basics and where applicable, foreign language.

The report is very inequivocal. It says the task force recommends that they promote and support proficiency in English for all children in the public schools, but especially for those who do not speak English or have only limited command of it.

At the same time, the task force considers the ability to speak and read a second language a valuable resource for both the individual and the Nation. Acquiring facility in a foreign language can help to improve a student's understanding and command of English and lead to the appreciation of the literature and culture of another people which is clearly educationally desirable.

It should also be an advantage in a business or professional career.

From a national perspective, young men and women with proficiency in foreign language are sorely needed now that we are increasingly involved in competitive trade and investment with the rest of the world. More and more jobs will be available in government, industry, trade, commerce, and the universities for Americans who can converse with other people in their own language and who can participate in strengthening our international ties.

This task force wants every American public school student to have the opportunity to inquire proficiency in a second language. Unfortunately, there is no practical possibility of obtaining this objective quickly. The negligence of foreign language study and instruction in the United States is of such long standing that we simply do not have enough language teachers to provide adequate training.

Nevertheless, we propose that proficiency in a second language should be a long-term goal. We must begin a training program now if we are to achieve that goal in future decades.

The Federal Government can help in the training of language teachers and in encouraging and assisting in programs for students with proficiency in English to learn a second language that may or may not be a language spoken in their homes. Our aim is to see the second language policy sponsored by the Federal Government and carried out by State and local governments. The immediate need is for a modest matching grant program to train language teachers. Even though it will take time and effort, we think that a comprehensive approach to the study of language in which fluency in English is primary, but adequate training in a second language is also made available, is absolutely essential if the United States is to be a leader among nations in the next century.

Mr. Chairman, the NEA has testified before this committee and in every forum available to it in support of proposed legislation to enhance and upgrade the status of foreign language instruction.

I would like to cite from my testimony before this committee, Mr. Chairman, in July 1981, several statistics that still maintain.

The first is from the President's Commission on Foreign Language Study, which estimates that American overseas investment at $300 billion, and foreign investment here at $245 billion, with nearly 50 percent of the earnings of the 15 largest banks in American coming from overseas.

The President's Commission concluded each billion dollars of exported manufactured goods creates at least 30,000 jobs in the United States; thus, proving our growing economy interdependent with the rest of the world.

These numbers are big bucks and big dollars by any one standard.

Another fact, in the mid-1960's, for example, 24 percent of secondary students study a foreign language, 34 percent of postsecondary institutions had admission standards requiring foreign language. These figures today are dramatically reduced, 15 percent and 8 percent respectively.

Finally, worse yet, another fact. National security needs. Higher education students enrolled in Russian fell 20.1 percent between 1968 and 1974, and declined another 14.6 percent between 1974 and 1977.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2708 proposes the authorization of $50 million, which is a good beginning. Specifically, the NEA supports the postsecondary components which includes and entrance or exit requirement for 2 years of foreign language study in order to qualify for funding.

We strongly support the provisions for summer language training institutes for elementary and secondary teachers. We are intrigued by the provisions for intensive summer foreign language institutes for high school students.

We will be providing more detailed reaction in our written terms which we will submit to the committee in the next few days, and we appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Bernie Freitag follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BERNIE FREITAG

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am Bernie Freitag, Vice President of the National Education Association, the largest professional organization of education employees in the United States.

I myself am a teacher of foreign language, teaching German at Council Rock High School, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, since 1961. I am also very much a creature of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA): I attended an NDEA Institute in Bucks County in summer 1961, an NDEA Level I program in German at Hofstra University in summer 1962, a Level II institute at Stanford University in summer 1963, and I received a travel-study grant in Germany as guest of the German Parliament in summer 1966. I was also a Fulbright Exchange Teacher in Bavaria during 1964-65. If it were not for opportunities made possible by NDEA I would not be a teacher today. With my background, I am particularly heartened at the attention currently being devoted to improving foreign language instruction, and I commend

the leadership of Chairman Perkins, Representative Simon, and the other 25 cosponsors of H.R. 2708.

I wish to stress the appreciation of the teachers of the United States for the consistent efforts of this Committee, and in particular, for your efforts, Mr. Chairman, to see to it that the very important role of our federal government as a partner with state and local government in the support of public education be fulfilled.

We have already received the first few of a flood of reports from prestigious groups which are diagnosing the status of the American education system, principally the American public school system, and will be making prescriptions for the future.

Many teachers might reflect their preference for more emphasis on action plans for improvement rather than prolonged study of the problem when they respond that the reports confirm what committed and competent teachers already know. Nevertheless, if our nation needs the catalysts supplied by these reports to cause us to focus on our public education system as a national priority, we can only welcome the reports. We hope that the determination they generate to achieve a sustained and alert partnership, local, state, and national, in the support of excellence in our American system of public education will result in solutions based on sound research, good common sense, and sensitivity to the diversity of needs for education and in education by all students, in early childhood education through adult education. The goal is quality, free public education for all.

In its report "A Nation At Risk," the National Commission on Excellence in Education lists among the tools at hand:

The traditional belief that paying for education is an investment in ever-renewable human resources that are more durable and flexible than capital plant and equipment, and the availability in this country of sufficient financial means to invest in education;

The equally sound tradition, from the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 until today, that the federal government should supplement state, local, and other resources to foster key national educational goals.

Mr. Chairman, the NEA has testified before this Committee and in every other forum available to it in support of proposed legislation to enhance and upgrade the status of foreign language instruction. Without going into the wealth of statistics available which underlie the urgency of the foreign language insufficiency of the United States, I will cite just a few which illustrate the scope of the problem.

According to the President's Commission on Foreign Language and Area Studies, American overseas investment is $300 billion; foreign investment here is $245 billion. Nearly 50 percent of the earnings of the 13 largest U.S. banks comes from overseas. That's big business, big dollars, big international involvement by any measure.

In the mid-1960's, 24 percent of American secondary students studied foreign language, and 34 percent of postsecondary institutions required foreign language credits for admission. By 1980 those percentages had tumbled to 15 and eight respectively.

Postsecondary enrollments in Russian dropped 20.1 percent between 1968 and 1974, and fell another 14.6 percent between 1974-1977.

H.R. 2708 proposes the authorization of $50 million which is a good beginning. In general we favor the bill.

Specifically we support the postsecondary component which includes an entrance or exit requirement for two years of foreign language study in order to qualify for funding.

We strongly support the provisions for summer language training institutes for elementary and secondary teachers.

We are intrigued by the provisions for intensive summer foreign language institutes for high school students.

We support provisions to fund model K-12 programs, controlled by local education agencies, to improve and expand instruction in foreign language. We believe that, once such programs are implemented, the language(s) to be taught will be determined by the interplay of resources available, demographics of the community, and other such factors, and that the scope of this provision should not be foreshortened at the federal level.

NEA continues to find unacceptable the provisions that all school-age population within the school district be eligible for participation, regardless of whether or not such students are enrolled in public schools. NEA will strive to have this language, which we view as a thinly disguised variation on the tuition tax credit theme, stripped from the bill.

NEA recognizes that a crisis of major proportion is confronting our nation's system of public education. The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education is merely the most recent vehicle to focus attention on foreign language insufficiencies as well as those in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and so forth. To combat this problem, NEA is committed to press for enactment of the American Defense Education Act (ADEA), a broadbased initiative providing federal assistance to local education agencies to assess and devise means of meeting the needs of students in these critical areas and to implement programs to do so, to improve teacher preparation in these fields through grants to postsecondary education institutions, and to make funds available for research on teaching and learning in these areas. We view H.R. 2708 as a useful first step in the major effort to achieve educational reform and assure that education is responsive to needs and realities in the American society in the late 20th century and beyond.

In conclusion, NEA is pleased to see the commitment to improvement and expansion of foreign language instruction in the nation's public schools and postsecondary institutions represented by H.R. 2708. We stand ready to work with this Committee to secure its enactment by the 98th Congress.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF MARCELLO FERNANDEZ, DIRECTOR, BILINGUAL EDUCATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ACCOMPANIED BY FRANK MIELE, PRINCIPAL OYSTER SCHOOL

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, my name is Marcello Fernandez, I am the director of bilingual education language development for the District of Columbia public schools.

I thank you for offering me the opportunity to address your committee.

Today, I want to emphasize the need for teaching foreign language in the elementary and secondary levels of our Nation's public schools. This need arises as a result of the national security, economic, and international political realities.

In the past, the teaching of language is aimed to satisfy knowledge. Right now, it is different. Right now, we have to satisfy competition and survival.

Today, America has to compete in a world where every effort and every advantage counts. We still are under the impression we must speak English, backed by the grammer of the dollar is enough, the reality is different. Today, America is struggling to maintain the value of our dollar in international markets.

A child who enters kindergarten today would be faced with the need to travel, sell, buy, and sometimes fight political or physically in foreign lands.

That is a fact.

The need to communicate now is more pressing than every. The need to survive is the order of the day.

What are we going to prepare our future generation, training them to use weapons of destruction, not training them to use channels of communications and understanding. Probably everybody in this room was exposed to foreign language instruction at one time or another. Probably very few can sustain 1 minute's dialog using the skills of the past.

Probably there were bad experiences that contributed to the decline of the use of foreign language.

But should we blame roads and vehicles and bad drivers and lack of maps, because we never had the need to practice another language or use our skills. The teaching of language is a rewarding

and enjoyable and tangible experience and no longer a torture for the learner or frustration for the instructors or the teachers.

For example, here in the Nation's capital, we have Mr. Frank Miele, the principal of Oyster School. We have 92 different languages in the city, in the District of Columbia. We have a bilingual school probably different from all other schools. All the children of the neighborhood learn another language. It is financed by District money, and you have children, blacks, whites, speaking Spanish perfectly, with no accent, that can be replicated in many other places in the United States. It is a whole effort.

I would like to conclude this testimony with a few facts. If today the tensions between the East and West due to a miracle would disappear, we would face this situation. We could not send enough representatives to the Soviet Union or China to take advantage of peace, trade and culture because they cannot speak Russian or Mandarin.

That is a fact, Mr. Chairman. However, the Chinese and the Russians probably could send some news delegations to this country. In either war or peace, they seem to have an advantage over us. Moreover, it would take a look to south of the border. Now, we find another frightening reality. It is predicted that wihtin 25 years, Latin American will double its population.

Do we have enough people to establish with our Latin American neighbors? This communication will be limited to people like me, to the Fernandez's and the Gonzalez's in the United States talking to the Fernandez's and Gonzalez's in Mexico and Argentina.

I think we are extending the opportunity to the Joneses and the Smiths to be part of the dialog.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I have appeared in committees asking for help in bilingual education to the Hispanics. Today, I want to reverse my position. I think the need for language is needed for everybody.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you one question. Do you think learning a foreign language helps a child in his basic education, and does learning another language help in understanding English?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is both. I have the experience with my own child, born in the United States. She is 11 years old, perfectly bilingual. Her vocabularly in English is one of the highest because of her knowledge of Spanish and, on the other hand, her knowledge of English helps.

I think that we have numerous studies saying that the introduction of any other language, particularly romance languages, contribute to increase the knowledge in English.

Mr. FREITAG. Could I respond to that question as well?

As a practicing teacher, I think the answer is both as well. I am very much aware in our local schools the students are able to select either French, German, or Spanish, and that is their first foreign language experience in our school system. We who teach, particularly the first and second levels of language, are quite accustomed to the fact that students repeatedly have some insights into the structure of the English language as they approach foreign language and need to understand cases and relationships between

subjects and verbs and endings. So it is clear to us that as we try to help them find a way into a foreign language, they are solidifying for the first time concepts in English that they sort of resisted as they were learning it within the English language itself.

Second, I would like to add that a foreign language in a high school today is, to my knowledge, the only subject besides the aggressive sequence of mathematic courses where a student is required to retain everything that was learned before in order to advance to the next level of knowledge.

In so many of our other course work they are elective courses or courses that are self-contained within a semester or within 1 year, but the sequence of foreign language requires a kind of learning and retention that is comparable only in my estimation to the advanced aggressive sequence of mathematic courses and they are challenging and they are good.

I think they are beneficial for both reasons.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you a question. When I was a youngster, modern foreign languages were taught, French, German, but we stressed Latin more so then. It was an absolute requirement that you had 2 years of Latin before you graduated from high school. That took precedence over modern languages.

I have often wondered whether Latin was more important to your basic education, developing a vocabulary and helping you understand language in general.

My son later came along and they stressed Spanish in the schools. When he got to high school, he took some Latin, but it seemed that the modern languages took precedence.

How do you analyze the situation like that. Do you think that Latin was preferable to the modern languages, or that the modern languages are more useful today?

Mr. FREITAG. I think the issue ought to be separated. I grew up in a high school that required 2 years of Latin before you were permitted to take a modern foreign language. So it was a hurdle one had to go through in order to be permitted a modern foreign language. I think that they ought to be viewed as separate tracks. I think the advantage of a modern foreign language is that it is spoken in a living language, students can identify with it.

There is a lot of purpose that a teacher can use to motivate a student. That doesn't say, or I certainly don't mean that the study of Latin is unimportant or not worthwhile for students. But I think it ought to be on an elective track, I think it ought to be offered to the extent that students care to select it, but my view is that it is probably assuming that is much more appreciated by a student at perhaps the 10th or 11th grade level than initially by a mandate at the 9th grade level.

In the 20 some years I have been at Council Rock, we have seen Latin come and go three different times. Each of those times it was the cycle had to do with the permanent qualities of the teacher who was capable of teaching the course. The teacher attracted the students, got them enthusiastic, and got them going, and they were not required in any grade level, it was an elective for every grade level, and at its peak with an individual teacher we had 4 years of Latin going and 2 years of Greek.

So from a very small core of students, there were a group within that that chose to go on with that teacher to 2 years of Greek.

I think it is a valuable course. I think it helped me very much in terms of understanding English, but I don't think it should be a either/or situation.

I think that it has its merit on its own and not in competition or by way of discussion from a modern foreign language. I think, too, in the elementary level, Latin would be a lot more difficult to deal with.

Chairman PERKINS. I can say that when I attended the Hindman Settlement School, they had some of the best instructors from some of the best colleges in the country. The curriculum changed after I left, and it was later operated by the board of education. A lot of those curriculum requirements no longer exist today.

You go ahead and comment on that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address to the teaching of Latin. I came from the old school. However, I found in my case in the acquisition of English that Latin for me was a torture, was one of the biggest headaches I had in learning English. Maybe if I could handle the situation in addition to teaching a modern language, I would continue Latin, but that is very ideal.

Going back to the teaching of languages again, I was raised in Cuba, Mr. Chairman, when I came here, believe it or not, the most important thing that I could cash in on was my knowledge of English. I think the knowledge of another language helps a lot in what is taking place right now.

A few days ago, I had the opportunity to listen to former Senator Stone speak in Spanish to a group of diplomats, and I was amazed how the flow of conversation went smooth. I don't know if it was the ability of the diplomat or maybe that he used the right language at the time to do it. But, I think, again, that the use of foreign language to prepare our children for the future will be of tremendous benefit.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Packard, go right ahead.

Mr. PACKARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We have been talking about Latin in comparison to modern languages, specifically in this bill, which would earmark funding for special language programs. Would you recommend that these funds be earmarked for modern languages only, or even for only a certain number or type of modern foreign language or would you leave it open to all foreign languages, including Latin and other perhaps less used foreign languages?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In this case, I would like to limit the scope of the bill, even though it seems that the present reality right now is modern language. I would exclude Latin or Greek.

Mr. PACKARD. You would?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would not.

Mr. FREITAG. I might come down differently. To the extent that it deals with elementary and secondary education, I think it is appropriate to emphasize modern foreign language. It is a very modest beginning and to dilute it further to include classical languages, I think, may not be a wise first step.

I think there will be additional opportunities for the Congress to come back to be inclusive. To the extent that it addresses postsecondary education, I think it ought to be a broad horizon.

My feeling on that is that research seems to indicate the most important thing about learning a foreign language, first foreign language in the elementary, secondary level is learning how to acquire listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, and once you have acquired that, to go on to a second language, however, esoteric, is far less difficult because the skill of acquiring is part of the individual learner.

So I think it is very appropriate to emphasize modern foreign languages in the elementary and secondary level and retain a full scope to the extent that this bill speaks to postsecondary education.

Mr. PACKARD. Classic languages apply to fields where knowledge of the language helps greatly. I took 3 years of Latin for very specific reasons. I had a medical background, and it was important in medical terminology; Latin has a greater application there than perhaps in any other field. In my experience, Latin did not become a conversation language and it did not do much more than help me in learning my own specific field. I think that this is often the case with the classic languages.

The question we have to ask ourselves is what we are trying to achieve. I think that the intent of the legislation is to provide a broader experience with modern language as it relates to other societies and countrys and their particular customs and language.

If this is the objective of teaching languages, should the scope be limited to certain modern languages rather than the full scope of modern languages? Are there certain needs in terms of our international relationships that justify limiting the scope to certain modern languages.

Mr. FERNANDEZ Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Packard, in this case, I can cite different starts with a different point of view. Obviously, we have to take a look at foreign trade and national security.

So we might go up to any of the modern European languages, we might say French is an important language, not just in France, all over Africa.

We can say Spanish is spoken frequently all over the world, Russian is very important right now, and we want you to know more than half of the world speaks Mandarin and very little do we do in that area.

However, again, the interests of the United States are so complex that there is not one country in the world that we don't have to deal with. So, I think it would be a very, very wide range.

Mr. FREITAG. Well, I think in terms of elementary and secondary, the overwhelming evidence—we will try to speak to this in our testimony—is that French, German, and Spanish are really present in great numbers. The kinds of numbers that would make programs that this bill deals with thrive. There is really little Chinese or Russian being taught today in elementary and secondary schools, but to the extent that they can be supported, I think they ought to be. Again, at the postsecondary level, I think the field should be—and the support should be as broad as possible because in essense, the universities that specialize in some language, be they language of the Far East or languages of Eastern Europe, or

otherwise really seldom studied languages, the universities that specialize in those are like magnet schools and they will draw enough students and enough educators to them so that a supportive program would have a base on which to thrive.

Mr. PACKARD. Languages are taught in a rather stereotyped way today. I don't believe it is much different than it was when I was taking foreign language. I took Spanish. After 2 years of taking it through the normal procedure in which grammar is emphasized, I still could not carry on a conversation in Spanish.

In contrast, some organizations use different language training procedures for a specific purpose. I can refer to a special language program for church missionary work that I have observed, in 2 months, a student who has had very little, if any, experience with a specific foreign language learns enough of the language to be able to carry on a conversation.

In other words, for conversation there is a certain language training program, and there is language education in grammar. The grammar education often takes much, much longer and yet perhaps is much more comprehensive.

My question then, is, What are we looking for and what do we need in our learning and promoting of foreign languages? Are we trying to cover all the purposes or to teach the details of grammar or conversation?

Mr. FREITAG. Well, it is very hard to generalize for the whole Nation, but I think it is fair to say that the tremendous revolution that was accomplished through the assistance of NDEA funds was to shift us from the olden code, decode grammatical method to having all four skills, listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as the purpose of study, and if it is safe to generalize—I realize all general statements are false, including this one—I think American education has adopted the four skills at the elementary, secondary level pretty thoroughly, comprehensively.

I know that there are programs that have specific targets, the type that you referenced, a preparation for church missionary work.

But we from time to time in our school had the request from students for some seminars that would specialize in the vocabulary, for instance, that airline stewards and stewardesses would need and we have responded to that or we have been asked to do a little bit about import-export terms, and we have done that.

But always that is addressing some students who have some separate motivation and it is kind of in addition to as apart from the corps of what we do in our program.

I support the four goals of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. I think fluency in all skill is important and it gives a true foundation for a student to feel competent in the language.

Mr. PACKARD. It appears to me that it would be highly motivational for a student to be able to learn to carry on a conversation as soon as possible in a foreign language. The most boring and discouraging influence would be to just learn words and phrases and not be able to put then together and carry on a conversation.

That turns people off, and they don't take a second year of language.

I am concerned that we incorporate those things that would motivate students to get deeper and deeper into the subject language.

Mr. FREITAG. Our most current textbooks involve students in the same kinds of activities as their age peers would be involved in abroad. So, for instance, our initial year includes students in preparation for a test that the students might take for a driver's license abroad, and they have to deal with those facts and realities.

It seems to me that with some assistance we would be able to start employing technology for interaction between students here and abroad. We have had pen pals for decades, literally decades, and they are marvelous things and they have been marvelous results.

We ought to be very close to the stage where it is possible to have video cassette pals so that a class would do some kind of a program or a presentation to a set of students abroad in a class abroad, exchange that video cassette and get a response to it, and it could be topical, it could be thematical, have to do with holidays or activities in the schools, when students would be involved in not only deciding what it is they are going to present, but how they are going to present, do the actual filming, do the actual interaction on tape with one another and directing it to the students abroad.

I think we will reach a level of enthusiasm for high school students that we have not had any chance to get near to.

I have an article from yesterday's Washington Post with me, that we are going to reference in our written testimony, where students at the University of Maryland were actually live interacting with a large screen TV and a phone hookup with students in an American setting in Miami, where the Cuban culture is very current, and they were actually ordering dinner and conversing as if they were together with the other groups.

So seeing one another, seeing one another live, the challenge was real. Those kinds of things cause our anticipatory glands to get excited.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I might say, we have to adjust. We want to be in the reality of our times and our children want to talk and be able to converse. Right now, we are stressing the practicality of communication.

One of the examples I have seen of why many people have been reluctant to take a language, in the case of Spanish, every time I talk to an educated person, they are expert in subjunctive in Spanish, but they don't know how to ask, where is the bathroom?

Mr. PACKARD. This is not the time to talk about the bilingual programs, but I have a question regarding the effectiveness of the bilingual program throughout the country, and the limitations on the funding of special language programs. Do you believe that it would be more effective to use the limited funds available for language programs for foreign languages, or for language education for foreign students in the United States. In other words, should we push modern foreign languages, or continue in the bilingual program where, we are teaching our foreign students in native languages, rather than teaching them to converse and learn in our own language, English.

Where would you place funding priorities?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I might say, bilingual is really a methodology and right now, they need this to place moneys in languages. For some people who like to use a version of bilingual that could be immersion, is very valid, but also, I am one of the first ones to admit under the name of bilingual education many crimes have been committed.

However, I think that a good immersion program will help, and will satisfy the needs in any language.

Mr. FREITAG. Well, I think the problem is when you say is it either/or, and you try to describe priorities from the Federal level, we have got to deal with students who are there, who are in our classrooms today.

If we just take Texas, for instance, as an example. It has a very significant population of students who speak only Spanish, and come to our public schools, and that is true in portions of California, I understand, as well.

We can't, it seems to me, ignore their needs now to wait for some day when we have more money to deal with it, so I think in reality, we have got to accept the students with the needs they have.

I referenced in my remarks a sensitivity to the diversity of those needs, and let those priorities be drawn at the local level, where they are confronted with the actualities. I don't think there is any, I am very supportive of the direction of this bill, but I hope that it need not be interpreted as being in opposition to responding to needs of bilingual students.

Mr. PACKARD. Thank you.

Mr. ACKERMAN. It appears to me that language is one of those skills that are most easily learned the younger you are. Young children seem to acquire the overwhelming proportion of their vocabulary by the time they are 6 or 7 years old.

Are we teaching language early enough in our schools, should we be teaching it in our kindergartens and our first grade classes and just vocabulary to build up this acquires reservoir?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Do you mind if Mr. Frank Miele, the principal of Oyster Bilingual School——

Mr. ACKERMAN. I wouldn't mind.

Mr. MIELE. I am very biased. Our children begin at age 4, some of them are 3½ years of age when they enter our prekindergarten. Our experience has been with immersion programs, immersion is coming to school every day, and only hearing and talking in Spanish.

In that kind of setting, we have had children, American children, from ordinary backgrounds, speaking Spanish within 8 months, within a year, and so by the first grade, after 2 years of this immersion, we then go at biliteracy as well as bilingual competence in Spanish, in this case.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Do you find that in those instances the knowledge, besides being able to ask where the bathroom is, is acquired by the time they are in the first grade, and are they as familiar with the subjunctive by the time they are in high school?

Mr. MIELE. Yes, because you see when a Spanish-speaking person speaks to one of our children in grade one, kindergarten, the child, first of all, recognizes that person speaks Spanish and will speak to that person in Spanish.

If his or her mother or father are present, the child will turn to them and speak only in English, even though the parent may insist or he may even start some broken kinds of Spanish.

So that we have children thinking in two languages. And our curriculum is established in such a way that science and math are taught bilingually at our school, and that science and math serve language development, and vice versa.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Say that again, you are teaching other subjects?

Mr. MIELE. In Spanish as well as in English, in both languages.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Does that slow down the learning process?

Mr. MIELE. On the contrary.

Mr. ACKERMAN. No matter what the subject?

Mr. MIELE. On the contrary, it enhances it because the concepts, the concept, if I may give you an example, the word in mathematics that we use a great deal, sets, in Spanish, its Spanish counterpart has no similarity at first.

The word is cojunto. As the children progress in mathematics through the elementary school curriculum, the repetition of this basic terminology in math, in Spanish and in English, kind of meshes together.

And so, the children have a greater understanding, greater depth perception in these very, very vital areas.

Mr. FREITAG. I would like to respond from a nonbilingual perspective. Part of the emphasis of this NDEA was also on the value to be garnered from increasing the amount of elementary education in foreign language opportunity, and it was not designed to be an everyday, 5-day-a-week subject, but something that might occur 3 days a week.

Generally, in more optimal situations, it may have been four or five times a week.

I think it is clear that the enthusiasm that is expressed by younger children for foreign language learning justifies the notion that it excites them about learning, it is rewarding to them and they do, indeed, retain what they learn.

For students who come from a family in which another language is spoken, it would seem to me also to reinforce the notion that there is value in another language. So often when a student comes into our American schools, not knowing English, we have a way about us of which, in essence, says to the students, your first language is unworthy, you might learn English to the extent that you persist in thinking and speaking that other language, you are hurting yourself, it is not good for you.

I grew up not knowing English before I entered school in 1939. My first language was German. The timing was bad, but the fact of the matter was I still to this day remember that whole notion that we were to go home and tell our mother, speak English, to the extent that she persisted in speaking German to us, she was hurting us.

That is difficult for students to deal with, I believe, today in any setting, and there is no reason for us in the public school system of America to be telling the children that something they know and are is unworthy. This country has grown on the basis of whatever one has brought to it, so I think it is valuable on its own right, it is healthy for children, because it instills a respect for those other

qualities, other good things about people, and put it in the proper framework and it is true that it is easier, children have less inhibition at that age to acquire a good pronunciation, take students at the ninth grade, there is still inability to hold them, but not quite as much.

The other students start to put that pressure on them, and that gets worse and worse as we get older and older.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Should we be switching the emphasis from German, Italian, French, and Spanish to Chinese and Russian today, or should we begin to look in that direction?

Mr. FREITAG. To the extent that the languages that are now being taught are working, and what I mean by that, that the students are happy to take them and that they are good sport for them, I don't think we should artificially change it.

If there were a desire for Russian, and it weren't being met, I think we should do whatever we can to meet it, a desire for Chinese and wasn't being met, we should do whatever we can to meet that in the primary and secondary level.

Mr. ACKERMAN. You mean a desire on the part of the students?

Mr. FREITAG. Yes, sir, I do.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Or in anticipation of a need on the part of the Nation?

Mr. FREITAG. Well, the reason I am less eager to embrace that everybody, everwhere in the United States should learn Russian or Chinese in elementary and secondary level is that there is less hands-on opportunity for students with those languages, apart from the school setting.

Usually, when you have a very strong desire for Spanish, there are some ties in the community that make it good and help it thrive, clubs that have festivals and activities and support from them.

The same with French and the same with German. I suppose that is why they have continued to be successful, even though we have been neglecting foreign language at the elementary and secondary level.

It is hard to find many places in the United States where there would be a significant level—we can name a few, but a significant level of that kind of support for Chinese and for Russian, and I think that is an important tie which will make it thrive at the elementary and secondary level.

Again, at the postsecondary, I think we have magnets, a university that is a magnet because of the quality of educational offerings in specific languages, and the students who have those interests find them, and they do thrive.

Mr. ACKERMAN. You say without that, there is no motivation?

Mr. FREITAG. No, what I am saying, without that, there is a component that can help so much that is missing, and you will have to go a long, long way to find other ways to make up for that lack.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is hard, too, sometimes, when we are talking about the future of the country, to come with an answer based on what we have rational. If you are asking me are students more inclined to learn a language that is popular, or they can use, easily, yes, I am inclined to believe, in total agreement, that most of the popular European languages, however, children needing in higher

education the use of Russian, Chinese, Farsi, Arabic, because they are not popular, in a certain way, we will have to use our imagination, our initiative, and see that we can produce in the future enough persons with the skills in those languages, according to the needs that we have in the country.

That is something that needs some brainstorming and produce something. We need it.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Thank you.

Mr. FREITAG. I think, too, as part of an answer to your question, sir, is that we have not, in the United States, many good materials that facilitate language learning, and French, German, and Spanish and some others.

If we try to pick out languages for elementary and secondary in which those materials are not even in existence and teachers are not trained, we are talking about something that is far more long term.

My notion was that this bill addresses the present need for much more foreign language learning, and it would seem to me we could address that need by multiplying our use of what is already on hand in terms of materials and expertise and then perhaps on a separate track move out into those more pressing areas that are not now addressed adequately.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Gunderson?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will try to be brief, if I can, this morning. Sitting here I feel like I am at a science and math debate we had earlier this year where we all agreed on the goals but differed on the proper method to achieve them.

We are facing that a little bit more. Mr. Freitag, you alluded to that. As I look at the bill, and I look at the authorization levels for the different programs, my frustration is, are we going to spend the money on those students and those programs that already would exist without the bill?

In other words, I look at my State of Wisconsin, and in order for my local schools to get that aid, they have to set up a program, grades 5 through 17. I can tell you, none of my schools will set it up to get a 3-year assistance package from the Federal Government.

And so, who is going to get it? It is going to be the specialized school that already has the foreign language concentrated program.

How do we take the limited dollars in this bill, and direct those limited dollars in a way that we can achieve the most benefit for the most students?

Mr. FREITAG. Well, I don't think there is anything wrong with capitalizing on what is good, because what is good shows the way for other people who want to get started. And so, it seems to me that although the sad thing is that the funds are limited, what I spoke to was a sustained commitment to this whole effort, that is what has been missing.

We have been on a kind of sign curve for decades about do we, don't we, will we, or won't we. I think if anything is ripe now, it is a wariness that we have got to make a sustained commitment and true partnership. That is why I referenced those reports, and con-

trary to what the administration is saying, they do affirm a very strong and positive role, cooperative role for the Federal Government.

I think it is modest, but making better what is already good is not modest, that is very commendable, and trying to expand what does exist to other places where it can exist, is also good, even though it is modest.

I welcome both of those steps.

Mr. GUNDERSON. How would you respond if we changed the bill to mandate that all of the Federal money that went to our local schools had to go for the development of an elementary foreign language program?

I have a feeling that if we had an elementary program that was quite good, the secondary program would develop by popular demand in that community.

Would you agree or not agree with that?

Mr. FREITAG. Well, it is an approach, but I think the approach that this bill takes is also well-reasoned. The fact of the matter is, if the universities and colleges lay out a requirement, it gets the attention of the students in school right away, and that may not be every purpose that we want to address, I want to include students who don't have ambition to go to college, but might have need for a language in the job area that they want to enter.

But, it is a start, and I think all of this has to be measured in terms of it being a start.

Mr. GUNDERSON. What kind of a problem do we have today with adequate and highly motivated, should we say, foreign language teachers? That is a big problem in the science and math area. We really geared too much of our money there to get that excited teacher into science and math. I suspect, as a student who took foreign language because it was required—I took it in college because I had to get a degree but I couldn't speak a proper sentence of either language today—that I am a typical, average graduate.

Someplace along the line, in particular in high school, I sure could have used a highly motivated language teacher to excite me about a language. Is that a problem?

Mr. FREITAG. Motivated teachers beget motivated students and vice versa. One of the initiatives of the Federal Government in career education funds has been a tremendous assist to us in foreign language in defining the applications, other than in teaching, whether it be in elementary, secondary, or high school for language, and that is a tremendous motivator for students.

They see a practical return, they see that they will be as they proceed in education developing a skill alongside of any other career skill that they have, which has the potential of putting them head and shoulders over their peers in competition in the job market.

So I think that is one major thing that has already been done.

As I reflect back on my own training in foreign language, which really began with the NDEA, I think without denigrating my college experience, what I learned about language and teaching of language in college bears no resemblance to what I do today, because I was being trained for an old system that is now passe,

thank God, but the NDEA summer institutes were tremendously exciting for me.

I was eager to go back and put to use what I was learning. I felt 100 percent better because of what I experienced. I want to add in a very strong way, the second level institute with Stanford, which took me to Germany for the first time in my life, and gave me experience in Germany. Austria that summer, opened up a whole lot of new motivations for me, and made me realize it was possible to travel this world and that I didn't need a university program to open that door for me, it had happened and I could build on that on my own.

We regularly, from my school, take students at Easter and in the summertime to Spain, to Mexico, to France, to Germany, and Austria, and Switzerland, and we have an exchange program each year in which students come from West Germany for about a 7-week period, the responding visit occurs in July, and then students from Japan come in the early spring, about 30 each year and the responding visit occurs in August.

So all of those things are at work now in ways that weren't at work when I was in school, and I think it is not a question of motivating teachers, I think if anything hurts the motivation of foreign language teachers might be the salaries, that surely, but also the question about will there be enough sections next year, will I have a job?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. One of the problems we find in school systems right now is that language teachers live a very precarious existence. They don't want to get more courses to get recertified because they don't know if next year they will have a job.

Sure enough, they will have a job, but outside of the classroom, someone will use the resources of those teachers in working private.

Also, in one of the questions, related to one of your questions, one of the things motivating the teacher is the early education of children. The children teach parents. If you want to find out what is going on in the world today, ask your children, and when the children start using any language, they motivate the parents, parents show more interest and put more pressure on the schools, so probably we should start around one of the approaches, there are many.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I don't disagree with that at all. As an aside, I think every politician will tell you, check the results of the mock election in school that day——

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much.

Since bilingual education was mentioned here, as a former teacher, I have observed very often we treat a child's first language, if it is other than English, as a disease to be cured rather than promoting the child's bilingualism as a blessing for him and for society.

I have also felt that while foreign language instruction for someone who is already proficient in English and bilingual education for those whose first language is not English, these are two different things. There is a certain relationship between them and we can learn one from another.

My wife is fluent in French. She is not French. She was born here in America and learned her French in American schools. I am

immensely proud of her when we go to diplomatic functions here in Washington, D.C., and she engages in lively conversations with the French Ambassador or the Ambassador from Mauritania.

I am somewhat envious, too, but I have noticed for the most part, even here in Washington, D.C., that most of the people she engages in the French conversations with are surprised there is someone who is as proficient as she is in their language.

I have also felt I would like to increase their pleasure, but decrease their surprise. We really should work on that.

I taught Latin for 10 years, and I am anxiously awaiting the return of John Paul II, so I can engage him in a lively conversation in Latin.

It doesn't work too well with the State Department, I found out, though.

I think we certainly need to make a major breakthrough in languages. We are living in a real world that we know is decreasing in size, in which communication is extremely important. Having traveled around the world back in 1958–59, and lived in India and Pakistan and traveled through the Soviet Union, I found out we as Americans can be linguistically lazy. We can't persist in that. English is spoken broadly, but there are just many instances where in trying to solve the problems of the world and in business and commerce, we need more and more people who can speak in another language.

We can't go on forever saying, "Well, English is so commonly spoken," because it is beginning to inhibit us more and more as the years pass.

If I may, I'd like to make a little pitch here, too. This is an area where I think there is a deep Federal concern. We generally say that education is a local function, a State responsibility, and a Federal concern. I think the Federal Government, with its national purposes and national goals, is the agency that can show its concern, particularly in the area of language.

I can think of no other area as important to reflect that concern in as language.

If the Federal Government is going to translate its concern for education into something tangible, I think language is a very, very logical path to pursue.

I really have no questions. Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Nielson, our new Member from Utah, has arrived.

Mr. NIELSON. I might ask the chairman and perhaps Mr. Freitag, has there been any discussion how this might tie in with the math, science bill that was passed earlier in the House and which included the foreign language complement? Has that been asked?

Mr. FREITAG. No; it has not been asked.

Mr. NIELSON. Would you like to comment on that? Does this complement or compete with that language in that bill in any way?

Mr. FREITAG. Well, in the long term, the NEA would like to see support for the bill that has been introduced, American Defense Education Act, which really gets the local level folks together, beyond the school community into the business community, and parents and students and teachers in deciding what the priorities are for the local level to use Federal funds of assistance to enhance the educational program.

We think that is the ultimate way to go in the support for all improvements in the school curriculum. I suppose that there would be ways that this bill could be viewed as complementary to the others.

I like the special emphasis that this bill brings, however, if folding it into others would cause a diminution of that commitment or emphasis, I think it would be a shame, and I am sure that before you get to mark up on all that type of issue, you will have well considered it.

My plea would be not to blend it, and then lose it in the process.

We have seen that happening in so many instances where specifically targeted programs have been folded into block grants, and essentially go out of existence, because of their being blended into a large contribution of dollars and any which way you want to go is OK.

Mr. NIELSON. My experience, if I may say so, is the opposite. Instead of folding things and losing them, when you add extra things, it seems like you get fragmentation, in other words, you get some in this program, some in the math-science bill.

Let me ask a general question to Mr. Freitag.

There was an attempt to target the math-science bill, the foreign language portion of it, to provide summer work or some summer incentives through industry to convince people to go into math and science.

I note this suggestion getting more foreign language training to give incentives to colleges to have it as a requirement. Is there any objection on NEA's part to some kind of an industry-type of approach which would get people involved in this field through some kind of summer supplemental pay or some work in institutes or whatever?

I know there is an objection to incremental pay during the school year. Is there any fundamental objection to some kind of subsidization of the summer period for either this one or math-science or any other program you are trying to encourage?

Mr. FREITAG. Well, I have some reactions that I would like to make, and I will say that I am working as a liaison with the National Science Foundation Commission on precollege science, math and technology education, and they are expected to report in September or October of this year.

From the perspective of NEA and from my own as an individual teacher, I don't think it really does me a great favor to take me out of the school setting, and put me into the industry for that month or 6 weeks in the summertime for a couple of reasons.

How long is it going to take to integrate me into some kind of meaningful operation for that business? I am not interested in tokenism, and how can I enhance that part of the job that I am being introduced to to make it meaningful to me and profitable and useful for the industry in question?

If I had my druthers, what I would like to do is work that will make my program better and make me better in the program, and that is what really rejuvenates me in the summer.

It is not a question, I am not anxious to be away from the kids, I don't care what the popular notions are, I am in education because I want to work with children, and I enjoy working with children.

of the things that attracts people into the various career fields in education right now is the information that is laid out in the colleges about what the amount, how many people are currently prepared in those fields and what the likely opportunities are of jobs in that area.

What I really want to be is a history teacher, I am told there is a glut on the market of history teachers, it may require me to look at little more into—I can have what I want, first there is some things I could be interested in, and prepare myself in those areas.

The time that I had to make that choice, I was going to go either toward math or foreign language and what was the final deciding factor was my advisor telling me there was a tremendous need for foreign language, which was not true of math.

Should I regret that today? I think not. On balance, I have had a very satisfying career in foreign language. I wouldn't have any objection to having a dual certification, but I would have to really go back and tool up for that.

Mr. NIELSON. Let me ask another question.

To give you a little background on where I was coming from, I was a professor for 25 years, I was also an associate commissioner of higher education for the State of Utah.

This involved nine colleges there. I left that job to go back to my teaching job at approximately 50 percent of what I was making as an associate director of finance. I went back for several reasons. One of the reasons I went back, was that I felt I was losing my professional training in statistics and I needed to get back to it, No. 1.

No. 2, I had plenty of consulting opportunities, plenty of work I could do, more than I could do, in fact. If I were not in a field where such opportunities were available, I don't think I would have made that choice.

In other words, if I hadn't been in statistics or something in demand, if I had been a history teacher, take that example, I couldn't have afforded to leave that and go back to regular teaching.

There must be several in the high school system, in grade the school system, who would love to be math teachers, love to be foreign language teachers, but they simply do not have the financial support to do it, and industry is doubling their opportunity, maybe double the wages. There has to be something that brings them back to the school, as I was brought back to it.

It has to be some way to supplement what you are doing and maybe take advantage of the fact that you are in a scarce field. It seemed to me like you can incorporate it without in any way destroying the uniformity of schedules and so forth in the regular academic year, without compromising that at all, there should be something to give you incentive to join those areas.

That was the target somewhat in the bill we passed on math and science. Is there something you can do to this bill to get people into this field? Is there something to get people to implement this?

I guess I am not asking it very well.

Mr. FREITAG. Well, I think the first step is—we are in agreement on that, by the way, with the several reports that came out already—that the salaries of teachers across the board need to be raised, and Governor Hunt, who is preparing the report of the ECS,

It is a problem to keep going over the summer, it is necessary on the one hand to go to the university to acquire the additional credits that are required by State law—I am a teacher in Pennsylvania—in order to be permanently certified, and it is a problem in many other States where there is recertification every 5 years.

It is very difficult to teach and also be attending aggressive educational courses at a university in the evenings or on the weekend. Your preparation will suffer; your correction of work will suffer; and it wears you down.

So the summer becomes rough in that regard. And a job in industry is going to run into conflict with that requirement.

Frankly, I think the best investment is to give teachers the opportunity to work at improving themselves, improving the curriculum, improving the materials for children, that investment will be working its intended purpose immediately come the beginning of the next school year.

Mr. NIELSON. My question is, how are you going to get more people into the math and science and foreign language areas where there is a shortage. You would like to expand the programs, so how are you going to get those people into those fields if you don't give them some financial incentive to do so through summer activities or whatever?

I know summer institutes are good. In fact, I went to the National Science Foundation Summer Institutes, which retooled my Stanford theoretical approach into an approach I could use and I thought it was good, and I believe it paid off in terms of my own teaching.

But in addition to that, how are you going to attract people into these fields when they may go to other fields which may be less demanding on them?

Mr. FREITAG. Some school districts are looking at, and there are recommendations for a 12- or 11-month contract for teachers, and that would keep them in the school working at it and enhance their salary as well.

The other thing——

Mr. NIELSON. But not relative to some other fields they may want to teach. For example, if I can teach an easy course in some other subject, and I have to retool to teach foreign language or mathematics, what is going to make me want to go into the other fields if there is nothing in it for me professionally or financially. If everybody has a 11-month contract and it is a lockstep operation, how do you attract people to these fields?

Mr. FREITAG. Well, I just wondered what does attract people? There is something within the teachers themselves that inclined them to one field or another in teaching. It seems to me that one of the dangers of teachers spending some time in the summer in industry and business would be that it gives business and industry a very good idea of whom they ought to recruit out of teaching because of the competence and skills and personality traits of the teacher.

I am not too sure that that kind of a program enhances the desire of the teacher to stay in education.

I would like to reflect on that and perhaps address it in our written comments, because I think the point is well made. I think one

Educational Commission of the States, emphasized that strongly just, I think, Sunday a week ago on the "Brinkley Show" on TV, that the first step is to salaries raise for everyone, then we ought to start looking at what is possible or necessary in specific areas to somehow enhance the career possibilities for educators.

We are very happy to look at proposals along those lines. We don't want to prejudge them either positively or negatively, but we surely do agree on that first step of enhancing salaries across the board.

I agree very much with what you said about teachers who may be in areas of oversupply and who are committed to education and love education and want to stay in education, giving them an opportunity to retrain into an area of scarcity, and I believe that you are starting out with the best component you can, a success for educator who wants to stay in education, and if opportunities through grants provided for the Federal Government were to be made, I think you would have a tremendous response on the part of teachers who are in areas that, because of oversupply or lack of demand, have their jobs threatened.

Beyond that, I think we would like as a National Education Association to respond to specific proposals. We ourselves are dealing with that problem, and perhaps we will be able to address it in the written testimony that we supply the committee.

Mr. NIELSON. Thank you.

Mr. KILDEE [presiding]. Thank you, Mr. Nielson.

I want to thank the witnesses this morning for your excellent testimony on a very, very important topic. Again, I hope that I, in some way, can help to translate that Federal concern into some tangible program. Thank you very much.

Mr. FREITAG. Thank you.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

○